arXiv:1403.7677v1 [math.RA] 29 Mar 2014

NATURALLY DUALISABLE ALGEBRAS OMITTING TYPES 1 AND 5 HAVE A CUBE TERM.

MATTHEW MOORE

Abstract. One of the early results in the theory of Natural Dualities is that an algebra with a near unanimity (NU) term is dualisable. A converse to this is also true: if $\mathbb{A}$ is congruence distributive and is dualisable, then $\mathbb{A}$ has an NU term. An important generalization of the NU term for congruence distributive algebras is the cube term for congruence modular algebras. It has been thought that a similar characterization of dualisability for congruence modular algebras should also hold: a congruence modular algebra with some extra (unknown) conditions is dualisable if and only if it has a cube term. We prove the reverse direction of this conjecture in a more general setting: if $\mathbb{A}$ omits Tame Congruence types **1** and **5** and is dualisable, then it has a cube term.

1. Introduction

In a variety $\mathcal{V}$ with term $t(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, the term t is said to be a *cube term for* $\mathcal{V}$ if for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ there is a choice of $u_1, \ldots, u_n \in \{x, y\}$ with $u_i = y$ such that the identity $t(u_1, \ldots, u_n) \approx x$ holds in $\mathcal{V}$. Cube terms have seen wide use in recent years in the algebraic approach to the Constraint Satisfaction Problem (for instance, see [2]) as well as in more classic Universal Algebraic settings (for instance, see [9]). The cube term is a generalization of both the Maltsev term and the near unanimity term.

Near unanimity terms have a long-standing and particularly nice connection with the theory of Natural Dualities. An early result is that if a finite algebra has a near unanimity term, then it admits a natural duality. The main part of this result is proved without reference to natural dualities in Baker and Pixley [1]. Davey, Heindorf, and McKenzie [5] prove that a converse to this exists if we assume that the finite algebra belongs to a congruence distributive variety: the finite algebra $\mathbb{A}$ has a near unanimity term if and only if $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})$ is congruence distributive and $\mathbb{A}$ admits a natural duality.

In much the same way that the presence of a near unanimity term implies congruence distributivity, the presence of a cube term implies congruence modularity. Since the cube term is a generalization of the near unanimity term, it was suspected that there was a similar connection between cube terms and naturally dualisable congruence modular algebras. A stronger condition that just the presence of a cube term seems to be required, however, since the group $\mathbb{S}_3$ is dualisable, congruence modular, and has a cube term, but the algebra obtained from $\mathbb{S}_3$ by adding constant operations for every element of S_3 is congruence modular, has a cube term, but is non-dualisable (this example is due to Idziak).

Date: April 1, 2014.

In this paper we prove that if a finite algebra omits tame congruence types **1** and **5**, then it is inherently non-dualisable. An obvious corollary to this is that if a finite algebra is is naturally dualisable and omits types **1** and **5**, then the algebra has a cube term. Algebras omitting types **1** and **5** are easy to find – every algebra belonging to a congruence modular variety omits these types. We begin with a discussion of Natural Dualities in Section 2, then in Section 3 we state and give references for the tools and techniques used in the proof, and then finally we prove the main result in Section 4.

2. Natural Dualities

The primary reference for the theory of Natural Dualities is Clark and Davey [3], and we cannot possibly hope to go into an equivalent level of detail here. The main tool used in this paper will be a theorem about non-dualisability stated at the start of Section 3. The aim of this section is to provide a definition and to give some properties of dualisable algebras.

Let $\mathbb{A} = \langle A; F\rangle$ be a finite algebra. The theory of Natural Dualities attempts to characterize when there is a class of structured topological spaces $\mathcal{X}$ that is dually equivalent to the quasivariety generated by $\mathbb{A}$.

A *structured topological space* is a structure $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{B}} = \langle B; G, H, R, \mathcal{T}\rangle$, where G is a set of total operations, H is a set of partial operations, R is a set of relations, and $\mathcal{T}$ is a topology (all on B). The structured topological space $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{A}} = \langle A; G, H, R, \mathcal{T}\rangle$ with the same underlying set as $\mathbb{A}$ is called a *alter ego of* $\mathbb{A}$ if the topology $\mathcal{T}$ is discrete and

$$\{\mathrm{graph}(f) \mid f \in G \cup H\} \cup R \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \mathrm{Sub}(\mathbb{A}^n),$$

where $\mathrm{graph}(f) = \{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in \mathrm{dom}(f)\}$ and $\mathrm{Sub}(\mathbb{A}^n)$ is the set of all subalgebras of $\mathbb{A}^n$. Fix a particular alter ego $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{A}}$ of $\mathbb{A}$. The two categories that we will be considering are $\mathcal{A} = \mathbf{SP}(\mathbb{A})$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathbf{S}_c\mathbf{P}^+(\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{A}})$ (the class of closed substructures of non-zero powers of $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{A}}$).

For $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{A}$, we define the *dual of* $\mathbb{B}$ to be $\mathbb{B}^\partial = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{B}, \mathbb{A}) \subseteq \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{B}}^A$. For $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{B}} \in \mathcal{X}$, we define the *dual of* $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{B}}$ to be $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{B}}^\partial = \mathrm{Hom}(\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{B}}, \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{A}}) \leq \mathbb{B}^A$ (the set of all continuous structure preserving homomorphisms from $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{B}}$ to $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{A}}$). For each $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{A}$ we have natural mappings

$$\begin{array}{rccl} e_{\mathbb{B}}: & \mathbb{B} & \to & \mathbb{B}^{\partial\partial} \\ & x & \mapsto & \left(e_{\mathbb{B}}(x) : \mathbb{B}^\partial \to \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{A}} : y \mapsto y(a)\right). \end{array}$$

These mappings are easily seen to be injective. When for each $\mathbb{B}$ the mapping $e_{\mathbb{B}}$ is also an isomorphism, then we say that $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{A}}$ *dualizes* $\mathbb{A}$ or (when we do not wish to mention $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{A}}$) that $\mathbb{A}$ *admits a natural duality.* Examples of algebras which admit a natural duality include

- groups whose Sylow subgroups are abelian (this is an equivalence),
- rings whose Jacobson radical squares to (0) (this is also an equivalence),
- algebras with a compatible semilattice operation, and
- algebras that have a near unanimity term operation.

One of the main goals of the theory is to give algebraic characterizations of dualisability instead of category theoretical ones. Quite a lot has been achieved to this end, for instance the characterization of dualisability in terms of a certain

kind of entailment of relations given by Zadori [12] and more generally by Davey, Haviar, and Priestley [4].

3. Tools

The proof of the theorem contained in the next section uses several tools and techniques from the theory of Natural Dualities and Tame Congruence Theory, as well as some techniques associated with characterizing when a finite idempotent algebra has a cube term. In this section we will state and provide references for these tools and techniques.

Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite algebra. $\mathbb{A}$ is said to be *inherently non-dualisable* if for all finite algebras $\mathbb{B}$ we have that $\mathbb{A} \in \mathbf{SP}(\mathbb{B})$ implies $\mathbb{B}$ is non-dualisable. Clark and Davey [3] provide sufficient conditions for an algebra to be inherently non-dualisable in the theorem below, and the majority of our efforts in the next section will be to verify that the hypotheses of this theorem hold.

Theorem 3.1 ([3], Theorem 10.5.5)**.** *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite algebra, $\mathbb{B} \leq \mathbb{A}^Z$, and $B_0 \subseteq B$ be an infinite subset such that*

1. *there is a function $\varphi : \omega \to \omega$ such that for all $k \in \omega$ and all $\theta \in Con(\mathbb{B})$ of index at most k, $\theta|_{B_0}$ has a unique block of size greater than $\varphi(k)$; and*
2. *if the element $g \in A^Z$ is defined by $g(z) = a_z(z)$ for $z \in Z$, where a_z is an element of the unique block of $\ker(\pi_z)|_{B_0}$ of size greater than $\varphi(|B|)$, then $g \notin B$.*

Then $\mathbb{A}$ is inherently non-dualisable.

In a finite algebra, congruence covers can be classified into just five types (enumerated as types $\mathbf{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{5}$), and the Tame Congruence Theory of Hobby and McKenzie [7] gives great insight into how the presence or absence of these types in a locally finite variety can be recognized in terms of Maltsev conditions and congruence conditions. Kearnes and Kiss [8] give a Maltsev condition that characterizes when a variety omits types **1** and **5** which we will make use of.

Theorem 3.2 ([8], Theorem 5.28)**.** *The following are equivalent for a variety $\mathcal{V}$.*

1. *$\mathcal{V}$ omits types **1** and **5**.*
2. *$\mathcal{V}$ has a sequence of idempotent terms $f_i(x, y, v, u)$ for $0 \leq i \leq 2m+1$, such that*
   (a) *$\mathcal{V} \models f_0(x, y, u, v) \approx x$ and $\mathcal{V} \models f_{2m+1}(x, y, u, v) \approx v$,*
   (b) *$\mathcal{V} \models f_i(x, y, y, y) \approx f_{i+1}(x, y, y, y)$ for all even i,*
   (c) *$\mathcal{V} \models f_i(x, x, y, y) \approx f_{i+1}(x, x, y, y)$ for all odd i, and*
   (d) *$\mathcal{V} \models f_i(x, y, x, y) \approx f_{i+1}(x, y, x, y)$ for all odd i.*

If a locally finite variety is congruence modular then it omits types **1** and **5**. Thus, finite algebras belonging to a congruence modular variety have terms satisfying the Maltsev condition of the above theorem. In fact, by re-indexing and switching the last two variables, the Day Terms of Day [6] satisfy this Maltsev condition.

Markovic, Maroti, and McKenzie [10] provide a useful characterization of when a finite idempotent algebra has a cube term, which we will now summarize. Let $\mathbb{A}$ be an algebra and $a, b \in A$. If there is a term $t(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and tuples $u_i \in \{a, b\}^m \setminus \{a\}^m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$t(u_1(j), \ldots, u_n(j)) = a$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq m$, then we will write $a \prec b$. Note that if $\mathbb{A}$ has a cube term then $a \prec b$ for all $a, b \in A$. If $\mathbb{A}$ has subalgebras $\mathbb{D} \lneq \mathbb{B} \leq \mathbb{A}$ such that for every term $t(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ there is some i with

$$t(B, \ldots, \overset{i}{\hat{D}}, \ldots, B) \subseteq D,$$

then the pair (D, B) is called a *cube term blocker* for $\mathbb{A}$. If the algebra $\mathbb{A}$ is idempotent, then $\mathbb{A}$ has a cube term if and only if $\mathbb{A}$ has no cube term blockers.

Suppose that $\mathbb{A}$ does not have a cube term and let $\mathbb{B} \leq \mathbb{A}$ be minimal for not having a cube term. In this case, the cube term blocker for $\mathbb{A}$ can be taken to be of the form (D, B), and we can make two useful observations about $\mathbb{B}$ and $\mathbb{D}$.

(1) If $u, v \in B$ are such that $u \not\prec v$, then $\{u, v\}$ generates $\mathbb{B}$.
(2) If $v \in D$ and $u \in B \setminus D$, then $u \not\prec v$ and thus $\{u, v\}$ generates $\mathbb{B}$.

Both observations follow easily from $\mathbb{B}$ being minimal for not having a cube term and from (D, B) being a cube term blocker. These observations and the characterization of finite idempotent algebras with a cube term will be the starting point for the proof of the main theorem contained in the next section.

The last tool that we will need is the existence of a weak near unanimity term. A term $t(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ of $\mathcal{V}$ is said to be a *weak near unanimity term for* $\mathcal{V}$ if it is idempotent and

$$\mathcal{V} \models t(y, x, \ldots, x) \approx t(x, y, x, \ldots, x) \approx \cdots \approx t(x, x, \ldots, x, y).$$

For finitely generated idempotent varieties $\mathcal{V}$, Maroti and McKenzie [11] show that $\mathcal{V}$ has a weak near unanimity term of arity at least 2 if and only if $\mathcal{V}$ omits type **1**. Such varieties are called *Taylor* varieties.

4. The Theorem

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite algebra such that $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})$ omits types* **1** *and* **5**. *If $\mathbb{A}$ does not have a cube term, then it is inherently non-dualisable.*

Proof. $\mathbb{A}$ does not have a cube term, so if $\mathbb{A}_I$ is the idempotent reduct of $\mathbb{A}$, then $\mathbb{A}_I$ also does not have a cube term. Select idempotent $\mathbb{B} \leq \mathbb{A}_I$ minimal such that $\mathbb{B}$ does not have a cube term.

Since $\mathbb{B}$ does not have a cube term and is idempotent, we can fix a cube term blocker (D, B) for $\mathbb{B}$, $a \in B \setminus D$, and $b \in D$. Thus $a \not\prec b$ in $\mathbb{A}_I$. Enumerate the elements of $\mathbb{A}$ as $A = \{a_0, a_{-1}, \ldots, a_{-n}\}$, and define elements of $A^{\mathbb{Z}}$

$$\alpha_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_n}^{y_1 y_2 \cdots y_n}(j) = \begin{cases} a_j & \text{if } j \in [-n, 0], \\ y_k & \text{if } j = i_k, \\ a & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for any $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in A$ and $i_1, \ldots, i_n \notin [-n, 0]$. If all of the y_i are equal to b, then we will omit them. That is,

$$\alpha_{i_1 \cdots i_n}(j) = \begin{cases} a_j & \text{if } j \in [-n, 0], \\ b & \text{if } j \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\}, \\ a & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $i_1, \ldots, i_k \notin [-n, 0]$. Let

$$C_0 = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbb{C} = \mathrm{Sg}^{\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}}(C_0)$$

(note that $\mathbb{C}$ need not be idempotent). When we are performing calculations in $\mathbb{C}$ using idempotent terms, we will omit calculations like $t(a_j, \dots, a_j) = a_j$ for $j \in [-n, 0]$ and $t(a, \dots, a) = a$.

We will apply Theorem 3.1 to this situation to show that $\mathbb{A}$ is inherently non-dualisable. We first verify (1) of that Theorem. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ be defined to be the constant function $\varphi(k) = 1$, and suppose that $\theta \in \mathrm{Con}(\mathbb{C})$ has finite index and that $\theta|_{C_0}$ has two blocks

$$\{\alpha_i \mid i \in S\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \{\alpha_i \mid i \in T\},$$

with $|S|, |T| > 1 = \varphi(k)$ and $S \cap T = \emptyset$. For ease of writing, say $1, 3 \in S$ and $2, 4 \in T$

Claim. *All the elements of*

$$\{\alpha_{mn} \mid (m, n) \in \{1, 3\} \times \{2, 4\}\} \cup \{\alpha_{mnk} \mid (m, n, k) \in \{1, 3\} \times \{2, 4\} \times \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\}$$

are contained in a single θ-block.

Proof of claim. We will frequently use the fact that if $u \in D$, then by the minimality of $\mathbb{B}$ the set $\{u, a\}$ generates $\mathbb{B}$ via idempotent terms of $\mathbb{A}_I$. $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})$ omits type **1**, so let $w(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a weak near unanimity term for $\mathbb{A}$ (and hence for $\mathbb{A}_I$). If $u \in D$ and $v \in B$, then since (D, B) is a cube blocker for $\mathbb{B}$,

$$w(u, v, \dots, v) = w(v, u, v, \dots, v) = \cdots = w(v, v, \dots, v, u) \in D,$$

and

$$w(v, u, \dots, u) = w(u, v, u, \dots, u) = \cdots = w(u, u, \dots, u, v) \in D.$$

From this and since $\alpha_1 \,\theta\, \alpha_3$ and $\alpha_2 \,\theta\, \alpha_4$, it follows that

$$w(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_2) = w \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & & & \vdots \\ b & a & \cdots & a \\ a & b & \cdots & b \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \alpha_{12}^{cd} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{12}^{cd} \,\theta\, \alpha_{32}^{cd} \,\theta\, \alpha_{14}^{cd} \,\theta\, \alpha_{34}^{cd},$$

for some $c, d \in D$. By the minimality of $\mathbb{B}$, the set $\{c, a\}$ must idempotently generate $\mathbb{B}$. Thus there is an idempotent term $t(x, y)$ such that $b = t(c, a)$. Therefore

$$t(\alpha_{12}^{cd}, \alpha_2) = t \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & \vdots \\ c & a \\ d & b \\ \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \alpha_{12}^{be} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha_{12}^{be} \,\theta\, \alpha_{32}^{be} \,\theta\, \alpha_{14}^{be} \,\theta\, \alpha_{34}^{be},$$

for some $e \in D$ since D is a subuniverse of $\mathbb{A}_I$ and $d, b \in D$. Since $e \in D$, the set $\{e, a\}$ idempotently generates $\mathbb{B}$. Thus there is an idempotent term $s(x, y)$ such that $b = s(e, a)$. Therefore

$$s(\alpha_{12}^{be}, \alpha_1) = s \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & \vdots \\ b & b \\ e & a \\ \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \alpha_{12}. \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha_{12} \,\theta\, \alpha_{32} \,\theta\, \alpha_{14} \,\theta\, \alpha_{34}.$$

Using the weak near unanimity term again,

$$w(\alpha_{12}, \alpha_3, \dots, \alpha_3) = w \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & & & \vdots \\ b & a & \dots & a \\ b & a & \dots & a \\ a & b & \dots & b \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \alpha_{123}^{ccd}$$

and

$$\alpha_{123}^{ccd} \ \theta \ \alpha_{143}^{ccd} \ \theta \ \alpha_{12}^{bc} \ \theta \ \alpha_{32}^{bc} \ \theta \ \alpha_{14}^{bc} \ \theta \ \alpha_{34}^{bc},$$

with $c, d \in D$. From the start of the proof of this claim, $\mathbb{B}$ is idempotently generated by $\{c, a\}$ and there is an idempotent term $t(x, y)$ is such that $b = t(c, a)$. Therefore

$$t(\alpha_{123}^{ccd}, \alpha_3) = t \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & \vdots \\ c & a \\ c & a \\ d & b \\ \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \alpha_{123}^{bbe} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha_{123}^{bbe} \ \theta \ \alpha_{143}^{bbe} \ \theta \ \alpha_{12} \ \theta \ \alpha_{32} \ \theta \ \alpha_{14} \ \theta \ \alpha_{34}$$

for $e \in D$. The set $\{e, a\}$ idempotently generates $\mathbb{B}$, and there is an idempotent term $s(x, y)$ such that $b = s(e, a)$. Therefore

$$s(\alpha_{123}^{bbe}, \alpha_{12}) = s \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & \vdots \\ b & b \\ b & b \\ e & a \\ \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \alpha_{123} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha_{123} \ \theta \ \alpha_{134} \ \theta \ \alpha_{12} \ \theta \ \alpha_{32} \ \theta \ \alpha_{14} \ \theta \ \alpha_{34}.$$

A similar argument will give us that $\alpha_{124} \ \theta \ \alpha_{234} \ \theta \ \alpha_{12}$ as well, completing the proof of the claim. •

Claim. $\alpha_1 \ \theta \ \alpha_2$.

Proof of claim. $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})$ omits types **1** and **5**, so let $f_i(x, y, u, v)$ for $0 \leq i \leq 2m + 1$ be the idempotent terms from Theorem 3.2. If i is even then

$$f_i(\alpha_1, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}) = f_{i+1}(\alpha_1, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}).$$

If i is odd then by the previous claim,

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(\alpha_1, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}) \ \theta \ f_i(\alpha_1, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{34}, \alpha_{234}) & \\ = f_i \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & & & \vdots \\ b & b & a & a \\ a & b & a & b \\ a & a & b & b \\ a & a & b & b \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \end{pmatrix} &= f_{i+1} \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & & & \vdots \\ b & b & a & a \\ a & b & a & b \\ a & a & b & b \\ a & a & b & b \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \end{pmatrix} \\ = f_{i+1}(\alpha_1, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{34}, \alpha_{234}) \ \theta \ f_{i+1}(\alpha_1, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}). & \end{aligned}$$

Combining both of these, we have that $f_i(\alpha_1, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}) \; \theta \; f_{i+1}(\alpha_1, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12})$ for all i, so

$$\alpha_1 = f_0(\alpha_1, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}) \; \theta \; f_{2m+1}(\alpha_1, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12}) = \alpha_{12}.$$

A similar argument will show that $\alpha_2 \; \theta \; \alpha_{12}$ as well. •

Returning to the main proof, we now have $\alpha_1 \; \theta \; \alpha_2$, which contradicts $S \cap T = \emptyset$. Therefore there can be only one block of $\theta|_{C_0}$ of size greater than 1. This is item (1) from Theorem 3.1.

We now prove item (2) from Theorem 3.1. Let $\alpha \in A^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be defined by

$$\alpha(j) = \begin{cases} a_j & \text{if } j \in [-n, 0] \\ a & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $g \in A^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the element defined in item (2) of Theorem 3.1. That is, $g(j) = \pi_j(c_j)$, where c_j is a member of the unique non-singleton block of $\ker(\pi_j)|_{C_0}$.

Claim. $g = \alpha \notin C$.

Proof of claim. We first show that $g = \alpha$. If $j \in [-n, 0]$, then $\ker(\pi_j)|_{C_0}$ consists of a single block, and $g(j) = a_j$. If $j \notin [-n, 0]$, then $\ker(\pi_j)|_{C_0}$ consists of two blocks:

$$X_j = \{\alpha_j\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad Y_j = \{\alpha_i \mid i \neq j\}$$

($\pi_j(X_j) = b$ and $\pi_j(Y_j) = a$), and $g(j) = a$. Therefore $g = \alpha$.

We now show that $\alpha \notin C$. Suppose to the contrary that $\alpha \in C$. Then there exists a term $t(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ such that $\alpha = t(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m)$ for some m. That is,

$$t \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & & & \vdots \\ a_{-n} & a_{-n} & \cdots & a_{-n} \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ a_0 & a_0 & \cdots & a_0 \\ b & a & \cdots & a \\ a & b & & a \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ a & a & \cdots & b \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \vdots \\ a_{-n} \\ \vdots \\ a_0 \\ a \\ a \\ \vdots \\ a \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $A = \{a_0, \ldots, a_{-n}\}$, the "top" portion of the equality implies that $t(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is idempotent and hence is a term of $\mathbb{A}_I$. The "bottom" portion of the equality then contradicts $a \not\prec b$ in $\mathbb{A}_I$. •

This completes the proof that item (2) from Theorem 3.1 holds. Thus $\mathbb{A}$ is inherently non-dualisable. □

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite algebra such that $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})$ omits types* **1** *and* **5**. *If $\mathbb{A}$ admits a natural duality, then $\mathbb{A}$ has a cube term.*

References

1. Kirby A. Baker and Alden F. Pixley, *Polynomial interpolation and the Chinese remainder theorem for algebraic systems*, Math. Z. **143** (1975), no. 2, 165–174. MR 0371782 (51 #7999)
2. Joel Berman, Paweł Idziak, Petar Marković, Ralph McKenzie, Matthew Valeriote, and Ross Willard, *Varieties with few subalgebras of powers*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), no. 3, 1445–1473. MR 2563736 (2010k:08010)
3. David M. Clark and Brian A. Davey, *Natural dualities for the working algebraist*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 57, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. MR 1663208 (2000d:18001)
4. B. A. Davey, M. Haviar, and H. A. Priestley, *The syntax and semantics of entailment in duality theory*, J. Symbolic Logic **60** (1995), no. 4, 1087–1114. MR 1367197 (97d:08010)
5. B. A. Davey, L. Heindorf, and R. McKenzie, *Near unanimity: an obstacle to general duality theory*, Algebra Universalis **33** (1995), no. 3, 428–439. MR 1322784 (96f:08001)
6. Alan Day, *A characterization of modularity for congruence lattices of algebras.*, Canad. Math. Bull. **12** (1969), 167–173. MR 0248063 (40 #1317)
7. David Hobby and Ralph McKenzie, *The structure of finite algebras*, Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 76, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1988. MR 958685 (89m:08001)
8. Keith A. Kearnes and Emil W. Kiss, *The shape of congruence lattices*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **222** (2013), no. 1046, viii+169. MR 3076179
9. Keith A. Kearnes and Ágnes Szendrei, *Clones of algebras with parallelogram terms*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **22** (2012), no. 1, 1250005, 30. MR 2900858
10. Petar Marković, Miklós Maróti, and Ralph McKenzie, *Finitely related clones and algebras with cube terms*, Order **29** (2012), no. 2, 345–359. MR 2926316
11. Miklós Maróti and Ralph McKenzie, *Existence theorems for weakly symmetric operations*, Algebra Universalis **59** (2008), no. 3-4, 463–489. MR 2470592 (2009j:08009)
12. László Zádori, *Natural duality via a finite set of relations*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **51** (1995), no. 3, 469–478. MR 1331440 (96i:08006)

Vanderbilt University; Nashville, TN 37240; U.S.A.
E-mail address: matthew.moore@vanderbilt.edu